



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/355,149	03/07/2000	ULF ASSMUS	2345/87	6071
26646	7590	05/22/2012	EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON LLP ONE BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10004			LEE, MICHAEL	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
		2422		
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
05/22/2012	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/355,149	Applicant(s) ASSMUS ET AL.
	Examiner MICHAEL LEE	Art Unit 2422

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/29/11.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) Claim(s) 1-8 and 18 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 7) Claim(s) 1-8, 18 is/are rejected.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 9) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/29/11 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 5, 8, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chau (5,870,087).

Regarding claim 1, Chau discloses a data independent clock signal (col. 16, lines 19-30), a memory 212 (col. 8, Lines 38-46), and a switchover device (206). Chau also states that the memory can be operated in different clock rates (col. 16, lines 31-42). Thus, the selected clock period can be used to reduce disturbances such as claimed.

Regarding claim 5, the clock signal in Chau is inherently synchronized with the A/V decoder.

Regarding claim 8, the clock in Chau is inherently synchronized with an external normal clock rate. (see col. 16, lines 19-30.)

Regarding claim 18, see Figure 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chau (5,870,087) in view of Allen (5,652,627).

Regarding claims 2 and 3, Chau does not disclose the FIFO memory as claimed. Allen, from the similar field of endeavor, discloses the use of FIFO (34, 36) in a video decoder and an audio decoder (col. 3, lines 34-47). Allen teaches that using the FIFO memories, any disturbance or jitter caused by ATM transmission can be avoided (col. 9, lines 30-40). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the FIFO memories of Allen into Chau so that the disturbances or jitters could be avoided.

Regarding claim 4, Allen teaches that the buffer can be any size (col. 9, lines 35-40). Thus, the period as claimed would have been an obvious design choice.
6. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chau (5,870,087) in view of Nuber et al. (5,703,877).

Regarding claims 6 and 7, Chau does not teach the means for adjusting the received data stream to the clock rate of the clock signal as claimed. Nuber, from the similar field of endeavor, teaches a lip-sync control (Figure 2) by adjusting the clock rate to the buffers (see also col. 21, lines 1-8). By using the lip-sync control, the lip-sync problem as mentioned in the background of the invention is avoided. Since lip-sync problem is also inevitable in Chau, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the lip-sync control of Nuber into Chau so that the lip-sync problems could be avoided.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot because the arguments do not apply to any of the references being used in the current rejection.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Lee whose telephone number 571-272-7349. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jefferey Harold, can be reached on 571-272-7519. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/M. Lee/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2422